

THE "CHRONICLE & DIRECTORY"
FOR 1874.

NOW ON SALE.

THIS Work, now in the TWELFTH year of its existence, is ready for do-

It has been compiled and printed at the Daily Press Office, as usual, from the best and most authentic sources, and no pains have been spared to make the work complete in all respects.

In addition to the usual varied and voluminous information, the value of the "CHRONICLE AND DIRECTORY FOR 1874" has been further augmented by a CHROMO-LITHOGRAPH

PLAN OF THE CITY OF CANTON,
THE FOREIGN SETTLEMENTS OF
SHANGHAI.A Chromo-Lithograph Plate of the
NEW CODE OF SIGNALS IN USE
AT THE PEAK;THE VARIOUS HOUSE FLAGS
(Labeled separately in the WORK MAPS OF HONGKONG, JAPAN,
and of the COAST OF CHINA;ALSO, THE
NEW CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE—
HONGKONG;

Besides other local information and statistics connected to date of publication, leading to make this work in every way available for Public, Mercantile, and General Offices.

The Directory is published in Two Forms, Complete at \$5; or with the Lists of Residents, Port Directories, Maps, &c., at \$3.

Orders for Copies may be sent to the Daily O'Hear, or to the following Agents—

Messrs. & Sons, ... & Co., ...
Shaw, ... & Co., ... & Campbell,
Amy, ... & Co., ... & Wilson, Nichols & Co.,
Forbes, ... & Co., ... & Wilson, Nichols & Co.,
Pheonix, ... & Co., ... & Wilson, Nichols & Co.,
Nugent, ... & Co., ... & Kelly & Co., Shanghai,
Shanghai, ... & Hale & Holtz,Hawke, ... & Hale & Holtz and Kelly,
Cape Town, ... & Hale & Holtz and Kelly,
Ches, ... & Hale & Holtz and Kelly,
Mincoung, ... & Hale & Holtz and Kelly,
Tientsin, ... & Hale & Holtz and Kelly,
Feeling, ... & Hale & Holtz and Kelly,
Nuggets, ... The O. & J. TRADING CO.,
Higao, Osaka, ... The O. & J. TRADING CO.,
Yokohama, ... Messrs. Lane, Crawford & Co.,
" ... Mr. C. D. Morse, Japan,
" ... Mr. C. D. Morse, JapanHongkong, ... Hale & Holtz and Kelly,
Mincoung, ... Hale & Holtz and Kelly,
Tientsin, ... Hale & Holtz and Kelly,
Feeling, ... Hale & Holtz and Kelly,
Nuggets, ... The O. & J. TRADING CO.,
Higao, Osaka, ... The O. & J. TRADING CO.,
Yokohama, ... Messrs. Lane, Crawford & Co.,
" ... Mr. C. D. Morse, JapanMincoung, ... Messrs. L. Loyaga & Co.,
Singapore, ... Straits Times Office,
London, ... Mr. E. ALZAR, London,
San Francisco, Mr. L. P. Fisher, 21, Merchant's Exchange.DEATH.
On 23rd instant, SOPHIA, wife of the late James Deacon, Esq., formerly of Hallebury, Herts, in her 73rd year. (By telegram.)

The Daily Press.

HONGKONG, AUGUST 26TH, 1874.

The case of Ellis v. MITCHELL, the judgment in which was given in yesterday's paper, bears upon a very important point in connection with the jurisdiction of Consuls in the Colony. It appears that the plaintiff was engaged as steward on board the American ship *Lathley* bound for Cardiff, England, the articles stipulating for a return of the vessel to a port in Europe or the United States, and it being agreed on behalf of the plaintiff that he should be of good behaviour. Upon the rather vague grounds that the man had been of dirty and wasteful habits, he was discharged in Hongkong before the United States Consul, and claimed damages accordingly, in the Summary Court, before Mr. Justice SLOWDREN. It seems that, upon the master at first coming before Mr. LORING, the Acting Consul for the United States, a question was raised whether plaintiff was entitled to two extra months' wages under the provisions of an American Act of Congress with reference to the discharge of seamen in a foreign port—the United States Consul being, it appears in such cases, entitled to adjudicate disputes between Captains and Seamen, and to collect three months' extra wages on the discharge of a seaman abroad, and remit a portion in case of misbehaviour. Acting under this authority, the United States Acting Consul disallowed the three months' extra wages due to plaintiff, and the latter in consequence sued for those wages and also for damages for wrongful dismissal.

It is of course obvious that the first question to arise under this set of circumstances was that of the jurisdiction of the Court before whom the case was brought—as there is obviously a conflict of law—and accordingly a defense was set up to the effect that the Court had no jurisdiction—the man having been regularly discharged before the United States Consul. As, however, the discharging the man involved also the settlement of his claim for wages, the crucial point in the case became whether the American Consul in this Colony had jurisdiction in regard to the settlement of the wages. The point involves some very interesting and fine questions of international law, but we are able to state upon reliable authority that the conclusion which Mr. Justice SLOWDREN arrived at is in accordance with the general practice in such matters, though there are some apparently strong grounds, upon which it may oppose in theory.

It is thoroughly established that all questions as to ship's discipline fall under the law of the flag to which the ship belongs, and the settlement of wages and granting discharge being of this character would seem to fall under this category, and are left in the hands of the Consul, who arranges such matters, provided that neither party objects to the decision arrived at. If, however, an objection be made it is customary for the Consul to raise no question of jurisdiction, he being, under ordinary circumstances, only too glad to be freed from the responsibility of settling such unpleasant disputes—and to leave the parties to obtain redress at the ordinary Courts of the place, provided the country be one recognised as civilised, and within the country of nations. The simple reason for this course is that, although in strictness the matter is under foreign law, no Consul has the means of enforcing jurisdiction in an English port—and the result of his pronouncing a decision upon a question if the parties do not voluntarily submit to his arbitration, is that he has no power to enforce it. Such cases, therefore, in practice come under the law of the flag, but the jurisdiction of the port.

In the present case the award is not practically affected by this question, because Mr. Justice SLOWDREN was of opinion that the action of the United States Acting Consul in

respect to the wages was acquiesced in by the plaintiff—but he intimated his opinion that, had the plaintiff not so acquiesced, the Court here could take cognisance of the matter—and in this we believe he is quite in accordance with the practice in all similar cases. With respect to a claim for damages for wrongful dismissal here, the case was perfectly clear. That was actually a claim arising in the Colony itself, as it was here that the plaintiff was dismissed. In regard to this, there could be no question of the Court's jurisdiction—and taking a general view of the merits of the case, we must say, it is a subject of congratulation that the defendant denied the charge, said also the pawn ticket did not belong to him. He came from Kowloon to get this jacket for his friend from the comprador. His friend was a Kowloon man.

The case was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

Sergeant Hip ANAN deposed to seeing the defendant attempt the second time to pick the complainant's pocket. On bringing him to the charge-room paper, like a pawnshop ticket was pinned on him, which gave him the idea that the defendant had lost his ticket to the Comptroller in pawn shop and the "White Cloud," redeemable in three days, to pay for his passage to this port.

The defendant denied the charge, said also the pawn ticket did not belong to him. He came from Kowloon to get this jacket for his friend from the comprador. His friend was a Kowloon man.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The case was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

The man was then remanded for the trial of the comprador. The man could not commit a robbery, and had not come up, so would have been summoned, and if not then arrested by warrant.

